

Message Text

PAGE 01 VIENNA 02937 01 OF 03 101927 Z

41

ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 IO-12 ADP-00 INRE-00 CIAE-00 PM-09 H-02

INR-10 L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-10 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 SS-15

USIA-12 NEA-10 GAC-01 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 OIC-04 AEC-11

ACDA-19 OMB-01 RSR-01 /155 W
----- 029586

P R 101813 Z APR 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 8408

INFO SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY HELSINKI

AMEMBASSY LONDON

AMZMBASSY MOSCOW 2272

USMISSION NATO

USMISSION GENEVA

USDEL SALT TWO II

USNMR SHAPE

USLOSACLANT

USCINCEUR

USDOCOSOUTH

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 3 VIENNA 2937

E. O. 11652 GDS

TAGS: PARM

SUBJ: MBFR: APRIL 10 DISCUSSION BETWEEN NETHERLANDS AND
US REPS AND SOVIET AND HUNGARIAN REPS ON HUNGARIAN ISSUE

GENEVA FOR DISTO

ALL OTHER MBFR CAPITALS BY POUCH

FROM US REP MBFR

1. BEGIN SUMMARY: HOUR- LONG SESSION APRIL 10 PICKED UP FROM
APRIL 6 QUADRILATERAL SESSION, WITHOUT SPECIFIC REF TO SOVIET
SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 02937 01 OF 03 101927 Z

PROPOSALS MADE DURING APRIL 7 DISCUSSION FROM WHICH HUNGARIAN
REP HAD BEEN ABSENT. RESULTS WERE INCONCLUSIVE. MAIN FOCUS WAS

ON COMPLEMENTARY STATEMENTS KEEPING ISSUE OF HUNGARIAN PARTICIPATION OPEN. HUNGARIAN REP PROPOSED A DRAFT HUNGARIAN STATEMENT (TEXT BELOW) TO BE MADE IN THE EVENT THAT ALLIES INSISTED ON A WESTERN STATEMENT ALONG LINES THEY HAD PREVIOUSLY DISCUSSED, TO EFFECT THAT WESTERN STATEMENT WAS UNILATERAL AND NON- BINDING AND THAT PARTICIPATION OF ITALY WAS NECESSARY PRE- CONDITION FOR EVENTUAL HUNGARIAN PARTICIPATION. ALLIED REPS STATED THAT THESE ELEMENTS COULD NOT BE ACCEPTED BY WESTERN SIDE, AND PROPOSED ALTERATION OF HUNGARIAN STATEMENT TO MAKE IT MORE ACCEPTABLE. EASTERN REPS THEN TURNED TO TEXT OF PROPOSED WESTERN STATEMENTS, SUGGESTING THAT IT BE CHANGED TO SOFTEN ITS IMPACT. ALLIED REPS INDICATED THAT ONE LIMITED CHANGE MIGHT BE POSSIBLE, BUT THAT OTHER POINTS IN ALLIED STATEMENT SHOULD REMAIN. DISCUSSION CONCLUDED WITH AGREEMENT THAT BOTH SIDES CONSIDER EACH OTHER' S SUGGESTIONS MADE DURING SESSION, WITH NEXT MEETING SCHEDULED FOR APRIL 12. END SUMMARY.

2. DISCUSSION OF HUNGARIAN ISSUE TOOK PLACE AT U. S. EMBASSY MORNING OF APRIL 10, WITH NETHERLANDS AND US REPS PRESENT ON THE ALLIED SIDE, SOVIET REPS KHLESTOV, KVITSINSKIY AND TIMERBAYEV, AND HUNGARIAN REPS USTOR AND PETRAN. NETHERLANDS REP OPENED THE DISCUSSION BY ASKING IF EASTERN SIDE HAD ANY SUGGESTIONS FOR FIRST ITEM OF BUSINESS. SINCE THEY DID NOT, HE SUGGESTED THAT DISCUSSION COULD BEGIN WITH A CONSIDERATION OF THE ALLIED PROPOSALS ON STATEMENTS CONCERNING FUTURE HUNGARIAN PARTICIPATION. HE ASKED IF THE EASTERN SIDE HAD ANY REACTIONS TO THE ALLIED TEXT.

3. KHLESTOV SAID HE HAD SEVERAL REMARKS. THE EASTERN SIDE HAD ANALYZED THE TEXT OF STATEMENTS PROPOSED BY THE ALLIED REPS ON EARLIER OCCASIONS. IT REMAINED THE EASTERN VIEW THAT NO SUCH STATEMENTS WERE NEEDED, AND THAT THE PROCEDURES PAPER EARLIER PROPOSED BY THE EAST CONTAINED AN OBJECTIVE ENLARGEMENT FORMULA WHICH FULLY MET THE NEEDS OF THE SITUATION. THIS ENLARGEMENT FORMULA REPRESENTED A NEUTRAL APPROACH WHICH WAS BETWEEN THE POSITIONS OF THE TWO SIDES. THE ALLIED TEXT, IN THE EASTERN VIEW, WAS ON THE CONTRARY NOT NEUTRAL. THE TWO STATEMENTS IN IT HAD THE EFFECT OF AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN BOTH SIDES THAT THE FUTURE PARTICIPATION OF HUNGARY, AND ONLY
SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 02937 01 OF 03 101927 Z

HUNGARY REMAINED AN OPEN QUESTION. ITALY WAS EXCLUDED. THE EASTERN POSITION, HE REPEATED, WAS A FAIR AND NEUTRAL ONE, WHILE THE STATEMENTS PROPOSED BY THE ALLIES SOUGHT TO CREATE A UNILATERAL ADVANTAGE FOR THE WEST. IN PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS KHLESTOV CONTINUED, AMB USTOR HAD GIVEN THE ALLIED REPS A TEXT REPRESENTING THE EASTERN VIEWPOINT, TO THE EFFECT THAT ANY STATEMENT MADE BY THE ALLIES WOULD BE NON- BINDING IN NATURE, AND THAT THE HUNGARIAN REP WOULD RESERVE THE RIGHT TO REPLY BY MENTIONING ITALY. FUNDAMENTALLY THOUGH, THE EASTERN POSITION

REMAINED THAT THERE SHOULD BE NO STATEMENTS ON THE HUNGARIAN QUESTION. IF, HOWEVER, THE ALLIES INSISTED ON MAKING A UNILATERAL STATEMENT ON THIS SUBJECT, THE HUNGARIAN DELEGATION WOULD HAVE TO RESERVE ITS RIGHTS TO RAISE THE SUBJECT OF ITALY AS UNDERSCORED BY AMB USTOR.

4. TH
SECRET

PAGE 01 VIENNA 02937 02 OF 03 101947 Z

42
ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 IO-12 ADP-00 INRE-00 CIAE-00 PM-09 H-02

INR-10 L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-10 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 SS-15

USIA-12 NEA-10 GAC-01 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 OIC-04 AEC-11

ACDA-19 OMB-01 RSR-01 /155 W
----- 029691

P R 101813 Z APR 73
FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 8409
INFO SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY
AMEMBASSY BONN
AMEMBASSY HELSINKI
AMEMBASSY LONDON
AMEMBASSY MOSCOW
USMISSION NATO
USMISSION GENEVA
USDEL SALT TWO II
USNMR SHAPE
USLOACLANT
USCINCEUR
USDOCOSOUTH

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 3 VIENNA 2937

GENEVA FOR DISTO

7. THE US REP SAID THAT HE AND THE NETHERLANDS REP HAD EXPLAINED THE ALLIED POSITIONS A NUMBER OF TIMES BEFORE. AN ENLARGEMENT FORMULA ALONE WAS NOT SUFFICIENT, AND WOULD HAVE TO BE SUPPLEMENTED BY A STATEMENT SPECIFICALLY MENTIONING HUNGARY. THIS COULD BE IN THE FORM OF A SINGLE AGREED STATEMENT, ALTHOUGH THIS HAD BEEN REJECTED BY THE EASTERN REPS, OR THROUGH AN EXCHANGE OF STATEMENTS. NOW IT APPEARED THE EASTERN REPS WERE PROPOSING THAT THE ORDER OF EXCHANGE OF STATEMENTS BE REVERSED. THIS WAS A POSSIBILITY PROVIDING THAT THE CONTEXT OF THE STATEMENTS WAS ACCEPTABLE, THE CONTENT OF THE HUNGARIAN STATEMENT GIVEN TO THE ALLIED REPS,
SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 02937 02 OF 03 101947 Z

HOWEVER, COULD NOT BE VIEWED AS ACCEPTABLE EITHER IN TERMS OF ITS REMARKS THAT THE ALLIED STATEMENT WAS NON- BINDING OR BECAUSE OF ITS SPECIFIC MENTION OF ITALY.

8. THE NETHERLANDS REP SAID THAT BOTH THE HUNGARIAN AND SOVIET REPS HAD EARLIER VOICED THE THOUGHT THAT HUNGARIAN PARTICIPATION IN NEGOTIATIONS NEED NOT AUTOMATICALLY BE LINKED WITH THAT OF ITALY, SINCE THERE MIGHT BE OTHER CONDITIONS WHICH WOULD BE SEEN BY THE EASTERN SIDE AS A COUNTERPART FOR HUNGARY' S EVENTUAL PARTICIPATION. THIS WAS A FURTHER REASON WHY THE SPECIFIC LINKAGE WITH ITALY ENVISAGED IN THE HUNGARIAN REP' S PROPOSED COUNTER-STATEMENT WAS NEITHER HELPFUL NOR PRODUCTIVE. THE ALLIED REPS HAS SAID THERE WERE TWO WAYS TO DEAL WITH THE HUNGARIAN QUESTION. ONE WAS THROUGH AN EXCHANGE OF STATEMENTS WHICH WOULD PROVIDE A BASIS FOR RAISING THE PARTICIPATION OF HUNGARY IN NEGOTIATIONS. THE SECOND WAS BY EXPANDING THE ENLARGEMENT FORMULA ALONG THE LINES PROPOSED BY THE ALLIED REPS IN THE APRIL 6 DISCUSSION, TO THE EFFECT THAT THE QUESTION OF WHETHER AND TO WHAT EXTENT COUNTRIES WITH TERRITORY OR FORCES IN CENTRAL EUROPE OTHER THAN THOSE LISTED AS DIRECT PARTICIPANTS WILL PARTICIPATE IN FUTURE AGREEMENTS OR MEASURES IS NOT PREJUDICED BY THE STATUS AGREED DURING THE PRESENT CONSULTATIONS; AND THAT THE QUESTION OF THE EXTENT OF HUNGARIAN PARTICIPATION WILL BE EXAMINED AND DECIDED DURING THE NEGOTIATIONS. IF SUCH A FORMULA WERE ACCEPTABLE TO THE EASTERN SIDE, IT WOULD BE POSSIBLE TO DISPENSE WITH STATEMENTS OF THE TYPE PROPOSED BY THE ALLIED REPS.

9. KHLESTOV SAID THAT THE EASTERN SIDE HAD ALREADY EXAMINED THE PROPOSED ALLIED STATEMENT, AND IT WAS CLEAR THAT THE FOCUS OF THIS STATEMENT WAS SOLELY ON HUNGARY ALTHOUGH THIS WAS NOT SPECIFICALLY SAID IN THE TEXT. FURTHER, THE EASTERN SIDE HAD EXAMINED THE ALLIED PHRASING SEEKING TO LINK AN ENLARGEMENT FORMULA WITH CENTRAL EUROPE. THIS WAS CLEARLY A GEOGRAPHICAL DEFINITION OF CENTRAL EUROPE, AND ONE WHICH SINGLED OUT ONLY HUNGARY AND DID NOT TAKE ACCOUNT OF THE EASTERN VIEW THAT ITALIAN PARTICIPATION MUST BE LINKED WITH HUNGARY' S. THUS, HE HAD TO REPEAT THE EASTERN VIEW GIVEN ON FEBRUARY 23 ON THE ALLIED IDEA OF A CENTRAL EUROPEAN QUALIFIER FOR FUTURE PARTICIPATION, REPEATING THAT THIS FOCUSED ONLY ON HUNGARY AND THUS COULD NOT BE ACCEPTED BY THE EAST. IN SUM, THE ALLIED PROPOSAL DID NOT TAKE ACCOUNT OF THE EASTERN POSITION, WHILE THE ENLARGEMENT FORMULA AS DEFINED BY THE EAST IN FACT REPRESENTED A NEUTRAL APPROACH.

SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 02937 02 OF 03 101947 Z

10. KHLESTOV CONTINUED THAT, AS AMBASSADOR USTOR HAD SAID, IF THE ALLIES INSISTED ON FOLLOWING THEIR APPROACH OF STATEMENTS, THIS COULD BE A ROUTE THAT THE EASTERN SIDE COULD ALSO FOLLOW.

IF THE ALLIES CONSIDERED IT NECESSARY TO MAKE A UNILATERAL STATEMENT RESERVING THEIR RIGHT TO RAISE THE QUESTION OF HUNGARIAN PARTICIPATION, THEIR TEXT SHOULD CLEARLY REFLECT THIS, BUT NOT IN THE FORM OF AN UNPRODUCTIVE TEXT AS PRESENTLY DRAFTED BY THE ALLIES. AND AS A COMPLEMENT, THE EASTERN SIDE WOULD WISH TO PUT FORWARD A STATEMENT ALSO RESERVING ITS RIGHT TO RAISE THE QUESTION OF ITALIAN PARTICIPATION.

11. THE HUNGARIAN REP SAID THAT THE EASTERN SIDE HAD GIVEN CAREFUL THOUGHT TO THE TYPE OF STATEMENT THAT HUNGARY WOULD MAKE IN RESPONSE TO AN ALLIED STATEMENT, AND THAT HE HAD PREPARED A STATEMENT WHICH HAD THE MERIT OF BEING FRANK, STRAIGHT- FORWARD AND PRODUCTIVE. FURTHER, SUCH AN EXCHANGE WOULD SIGNIFY THAT TO SOME EXTENT THE QUESTION OF HUNGARY WOULD BE LEFT IN SUSPENSE. HOWEVER, SINCE THE ALLIED SIDE WOULD BE RESERVING ITS RIGHTS TO RAISE HUNGARY, THE EASTERN SIDE WOULD ALSO WISH TO RESERVE ITS RIGHT TO CONDITION HUNGARIAN PARTICIPATION ON THAT OF ITALY, HUNGARIAN REP THEN CIRCULATED A PROPOSED STATEMENT BY HUNGARY, OF WHICH TEXT IS AS FOLLOWS.

12. BEGIN TEXT: " IN CONNECTION WITH THE STATEMENT OF THE DELEGATION OF THE HUNGARIAN PEOPLE' S REPUBLIC WISHES TO STATE THE FOLLOWING.

THE STATEMENT OF IS UNILATERAL AND CANNOT IMPOSE ANY OBLIGATIONS ON THE HUNGARIAN PEOPLE' S REPUBLIC AND OTHER SOCIALIST COUNTRIES PARTICIPATING IN THE CONSULTATIONS. AS FOR THE PARTICIPATION OF THE HUNGARINA PEOPLE' S REPUBLIC IN POSSIBLE AGREEMENTS AND DECISIONS IT IS NOT EXCLUDED ONLY IF ITALY ALSO PARTICIPATES IN SUCH AGREEMENTS AND DECISIONS, I. E. IF CONDITIONS KNOWN TO THE WESTERN COUNTRIES AND EXPLAINED TO THEM DURING THE COURSE OF THE CONSULTATIONS BY THE REPRESENTATIVES OF HUNGARY AND OTHER SOCIALIST COUNTRIES ARE FULFILLED." END TEXT.

13. THE US REP SAID THAT IT WAS AN ADVANTAGE SIMPLY TO HAVE SUCH A TEXT ON THE TABLE ALTHOUGH ITS NEGATIVE CONTENT DID NOT COME AS A SURPRISE. THE NETHERLANDS REP HAD TWO SPECIFIC REMARKS TO MAKE.
SECRET

PAGE 04 VIENNA 02937 02 OF 03 101947 Z

FIRST, THE IDEA IN THE HUNGARIAN TEXT TO THE EFFECT THAT THE ALLIED STATEMENTS WERE UNILATERAL AND COULD NOT IMPOSE ANY OBLIGATIONS ON HUNGARY WAS CRUDE IN TERMS OF WORDING, AS WELL AS NON- PRODUCTIVE. IT WOULD BE ADVISABLE TO CHANGE IT.

SECRET

ADP000

PAGE 01 VIENNA 02937 03 OF 03 101956 Z

41

ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 IO-12 ADP-00 INRE-00 CIAE-00 PM-09 H-02

INR-10 L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-10 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 SS-15

USIA-12 NEA-10 GAC-01 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 OIC-04 AEC-11

ACDA-19 OMB-01 RSR-01 /155 W

----- 029764

P R 101813 Z APR 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 8410

INFO SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY HELSINKI

AMEMBASSY LONDON

AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

USMISSION NATO

USMISSION GENEVA

USDEL SALT TWO II

USNMR SHAPE

USLOSACLANT

USCINCEUR

USDOCOSOUTH

S E C R E T SECTION 3 OF 3 VIENNA 2937

GENEVA FOR DISTO

SECONDLY, THE EFFORT IN THE HUNGARIAN STATEMENT TO MAKE HUNGARIAN PARTICIPATION CONDITIONAL ON THAT OF ITALY WAS ALSO NON- PRODUCTIVE. EARLIER THE HUNGARIAN REP HAD SAID THAT THERE MIGHT BE OTHER CONDITIONS WHICH WOULD BALANCE HUNGARIAN PARTICIPATION, AND ELSEWHERE IN THE TEXT THERE WAS MENTION OF CONDITIONS KNOWN TO THE ALLIES AND EXPLAINED TO THEM IN LIGHT OF THIS, WHY WAS IT NECESSARY TO MAKE SPECIFIC REF TO ITALY IN SUCH A TEXT? SUCH REF WAS NOT ACCEPTABLE TO THE ALLIED SIDE, AND SHOULD BE DROPPED.

14. THE US REP SAID HE HAD A SUGGESTION FOR SHORTENING THE
SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 02937 03 OF 03 101956 Z

HUNGARIAN TEXT. IT COULD SIMPLY SAY THAT " THE QUESTION OF HUNGARIAN PARTICIPATION IN AGREEMENTS AND DECISIONS IS POSSIBLE UNDER APPROPRIATE CONDITIONS." USTOR SAID THAT HE PREFERRED THE PRESENT WORDING, SINCE IT WAS CLEAR AND UNAMBIGUOUS, ESPECIALLY IN TERMS OF CITING ITALY AS A COUNTERPART TO HUNGARY.

15. KHLESTOV SAID THAT IF THE ALLIES INSISTED ON THEIR VERSION

OF AN ALLIED STATEMENT ON THE HUNGARIAN PARTICIPATION, WHICH CLEARLY MENTIONED HUNGARY, IT WOULD BE POSSIBLE TO SHORTEN THE STATEMENT JUST DISTRIBUTED BY THE HUNGARIAN REP TO INCLUDE ONLY THE FIRST SENTENCE OF THE OPERATIVE PARA, I. E., TO THE EFFECT THAT THE ALLIED STATEMENT WAS UNILATERAL AND NON- BINDING ON HUNGARY AND OTHER SOCIALIST COUNTRIES. HOWEVER, IN AN ATTEMPT TO FIND A COMPROMISE, THE EASTERN SIDE WAS WILLING TO GO FURTHER AND ADD A SECOND SENTENCE TO INDICATE THAT THE QUESTION OF HUNGARIAN PARTICIPATION IN AGREEMENTS OR DECISIONS WAS NOT EXCLUDED. THIS REPRESENTED A CONCESSION BY THE EASTERN SIDE BUT ONE THAT WAS NOT LOGICALLY NECESARY. IN SHORT, THE HUNGARIAN STATEMENT COULD BE CUT DOWN TO JUST THE FIRST SENTENCE, AND THE ALLIES SHOULD BEAR THIS IN MIND IN CONSIDERING WHAT THEIR OWN STATEMENT SHOULD SAY.

16. THE NETHERLANDS REP SAID THAT THE TEXT CIRCULATED BY THE HUNGARIAN REP SEEMED TO MISS THE POINT OF THE OBJECTIVE OF COMPLEMENTARY STATEMENTS AS PROPOSED BY THE ALLIES, WHICH WAS TO HAVE THE RIGHT TO RAISE THE QUESTION OF HUNGARIAN PARTICIPATION IN PART OF IN WHOLE IN THE NEGOTIATIONS. FURTHER, THE HUNGARIAN TEXT MADE SPECIFIC MENTION OF ITALY WITH WHICH THE ALLIED SIDE COULD NOT AGREE, AND WHICH FURTHER WAS NOT LOGICALLY NECESSARY. THE US REP SAID THAT IT MIGHT BE USEFUL TO EXAMINE THE PROPOSED ALLIED STATEMENT. IF THE HUNGARIAN STATEMENT WERE ENVISAGED AS A REPLY TO ALLIED STATEMENT THE LEAD SENTENCE OF THE ALLIED STATEMENT COULD BE SHORTENED TO READ, " THE REPS OF (BLANK) WISH TO POINT OUT THAT ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE PARTICIPATION OF HUNGARY IN THESE CONSULTATIONS ARE WITHOUT PREJUDICE TO THE NATURE OF HUNGARY' S PARTICIPATION IN FUTURE NEGOTIATIONS, ETC." IN THE NEXT SENTENCE IT WOULD ALSO BE POSSIBLE TO CHANGE THE WORDS " IT IS AGREED" THAT THE QUESTION OF HUNGARY' S INCLUSION IN FUTURE AGREEMENTS OR MEASURES MUST BE DECIDED IN NEGOTIATIONS TO " IT IS CONSIDERED." KVITSINSKIY INTERJECTED TO SAY THAT THE ALLIES MAY CONSIDER IT SO, BUT IT IS NOT CONSIDERED BY ALL. THE US REP SAID IN THIS CASE,

SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 02937 03 OF 03 101956 Z

IT MIGHT UNDER CONDITIONS OF A FAVORABLE HUNGARIAN STATEMENT BE POSSIBLE TO TELESCOPE THE TEXT OF THE ALLIED STATEMENT INTO ONE SENTENCE, WHICH WOULD READ, " THE REPS OF (BLANK) WISH TO POINT OUT THAT ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE PARTICIPATION OF HUNGARY IN THESE CONSULTATIONS ARE WITHOUT PREJUDICE TO THE NATURE OF HUNGARY' S PARTICIPATION IN FUTURE NEGOTIATIONS, DECISIONS OR AGREED MEASURES, OR TO THE SECURITY OF ANY PARTY, AND THAT THE QUESTION OF HOW AND TO WHAT EXTENT HUNGARY WILL BE INCLUDED IN FUTURE DECISIONS, AGREEMENTS OR MEASURES MUST BE DECIDED DURING THE PENDING NEGOTIATIONS.

17. KVITSINSKIY SAID THAT THE WORD " HOW" SHOULD BE CHANGED TO " WHETHER." THE US REP REPLIED THAT THE TEXT UNDER DISCUSSION WAS NOT AN AGREED STATEMENT, BUT ONE OF A COMPLEMENTARY PAIR

OF STATEMENTS. KVITSINSKIY AGAIN SAID " WHETHER" WOULD BE A BETTER WORD, AND USTOR PROPOSED " IF." THE ALLIED REPS SAID THAT THEY WERE NOT PREPARED TO ACCEPT THESE CHANGES.

18. KVITSINSKIY CHALLENGED THE WORD " WILL" IN THE PHRASE " TO WHAT EXTENT HUNGARY WILL BE INCLUDED IN FUTURE DECISIONS, ETC," SAYING IT SHOULD BE CHANGED TO " COULD," " CAN," OR " MIGHT." HE FURTHER QUESTIONED THE WORD " MUST." THE US REP SUMMARIZED BY SAYING THAT THE EASTERN SIDE HAD RAISED FOUR OBJECTIONS TO THE ALLIED TEXT IN THE FORM OF THE WORDS " AGREED," " HOW," " WILL" AND " MUST." THE ALLIED SIDE HAD PROPOSED POSSIBLE DELETION OF THE PHRASE " IT IS AGREED." THUS, THERE WERE PROPOSALS BY EACH SIDE ON THE TEXTS OF THE OTHER SIDE, AND IT MIGHT BE USEFUL TO RESUME THE DISCUSSION AFTER SOME FURTHER REFLECTION.

19. AFTER BRIEF DISCUSSION,

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 07 MAY 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 10 APR 1973
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: boyleja
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1973VIENNA02937
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: N/A
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: VIENNA
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1973/newtext/t19730460/abqcellu.tel
Line Count: 394
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: ACTION MBF
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 8
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: boyleja
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags: ANOMALY
Review Date: 06 SEP 2001
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: WITHDRAWN <02-Aug-2001 by reddocgw, RDFRD>; RELEASED <06-Sep-2001 by boyleja>; APPROVED <10-Sep-2001 by boyleja>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: <DBA CORRECTED> gwr 971218
Subject: MBFR: APRIL 10 DISCUSSION BETWEEN NETHERLANDS AND US REPS AND SOVIET AND HUNGARIAN REPS ON HUNGARIAN
ISSUE
TAGS: PARM
To: STATE INFO SECDEF
BONN
HELSINKI
LONDON
AMZMBASSY MOSCOW
NATO

GENEVA
SALT TWO II
USNMR SHAPE
USLOSACLANT
USCINCEUR
USDOCOSOUTH

Type: TE

Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005